

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application as presently amended is respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added.

The Office Action initially indicates that "Applicant is required to furnish a drawing under 37 CFR § 1.81(c)." In response, Applicant respectfully submits that FIGS. 1-5 were submitted with the application as originally filed, as evidenced by the inclusion of FIGS. 1-5 in the application as published as U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0162081. For the convenience of the Examiner, Applicant submits with this response another copy of FIGS. 1-5 as originally filed.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended are not indefinite and respectfully requests that the indefiniteness rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 1,733,034 to Tufenkjian ("Tufenkjian") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,826,249 to Bradbury ("Bradbury"). Tufenkjian is directed to a pneumatic mattress that includes a plurality of tubes 1 formed of rubber or another resilient material. The tubes 1 are held in spaced relation by a cover 2 formed with casings 3 to receive the tubes 1. Portions of the cover 2 between the casings 3 form strips 4 which separate adjacent ones of the casings 3. Bradbury is directed to a thin inflatable elastomeric vehicle seat that includes a pair of elastomeric sheets that are heat sealed together to define a peripheral manifold and discrete horizontal sections. The horizontal sections are pressurized with a gas to stretch the elastomeric material into its hysteresis range and then attach the same to a frame to provide a cushioned seat. Bradbury has been cited as teaching use of the same cushioned structure for a seat cushion and a backrest cushion.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Tufenkjian nor Bradbury, singularly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least one of the distinguishing features of amended independent claim 1, namely, a plurality of low-elasticity textile tubular pockets arranged side-by-side, wherein adjacent tubular pockets of the plurality of tubular pockets are directly

interconnected via seams. As illustrated in, for example, FIG. 3 of Tufenkjian, the strips 4 are used to provide separation between the casings 3. Thus, unlike independent claim 1 as amended, the portions of the cover 2 that form the casings 3 to receive the tubes 1 are not directly interconnected via seams; rather, adjacent ones of the casings 3 are separated from one another by the strips 4. Applicant respectfully submits that Bradbury fails to cure the deficiencies noted above of Tufenkjian.

Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above, the amended independent claim 1 distinguishes over the cited combination of Tufenkjian and Bradbury. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 as obvious over the cited combination of Tufenkjian and Bradbury is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 2-4 dependent from and further limit independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. These dependent claims are therefore deemed to distinguish over the cited combination of Tufenkjian and Bradbury for at least the same reasons as those set forth above relative to the rejection of independent claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-4 as obvious over the cited combination of Tufenkjian and Bradbury is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tufenkjian in view of Bradbury and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,965,899 to Sekido et al. ("Sekido"). Sekido has been cited as teaching an inflatable cushion including tubular elements that vary in size. Applicant respectfully submits that Sekido fails to cure the deficiencies noted above of Tufenkjian and Bradbury. In particular, Sekido fails to teach or suggest adjacent tubular pockets being directly interconnected via seams.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-7 distinguish over the cited combination of Tufenkjian, Bradbury, and Sekido. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 5-7 as obvious over the cited combination of Tufenkjian, Bradbury, and Sekido is respectfully requested.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Dated: Jan. 19, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ross T. Robinson

Registration No.: 47,031

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL  
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

214-855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant